Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 25 1957
JOHN T. FEY, Clerk

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1957.

No. 578

CORNELL JOEL GROSSMAN, D.D.S., *Petitioner,*

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, *Respondents.*

An Appeal From Determination of the United States Court of Appeals, for the District of Columbia Circuit

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

CORNELL JOEL GROSSMAN, D.D.S.
46 Old Short Hills Road
Millburn, New Jersey
Pro Se.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1957

No.

CORNELL JOEL GROSSMAN, D.D.S., *Petitioner,*

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, *Respondents.*

An Appeal From Determination of the United States Court of Appeals, for the District of Columbia Circuit

---

AS THE INVENTOR WHO FIRST GAVE THE ATOMIC HYDROGEN BOMB FORMULAS TO THE UNITED STATES, PETITIONER PRAYS THAT THE SUPREME COURT REMAND THIS CASE TO THE UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION FOR JUST COMPENSATION AND RECOGNITION.

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

(a) Ref: The United States Court of Appeals, for the District of Columbia Circuit, in Case No. 12959, decided June 13, 1957, that Cornell Joel Grossman,

petitioner *pro se*, "has no valid claim under the Atomic Energy Acts" for compensation as the inventor who first gave the atomic hydrogen bomb formulas to the United States of America. This opinion is appended to this statement.

(b)(i) This is an appeal for compensation, since Appellant did give the atomic hydrogen bomb formulas to the United States Government. This appeal is taken pursuant to Public Laws—CH 724, Aug. 1, 1946, (60 Stat., Sec. 11 (4)), cited as the "Atomic Energy Act of 1946".

(ii) The date of the judgment sought to be reviewed and the time of its entry is June 13, 1957.

The date the Notice of Appeal was filed is July 1, 1957, in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(iii) The statutory provision believed to confer on the Supreme Court's jurisdiction of this Appeal is Public Laws—CH 724, Aug. 1, 1946, (60 Stat., Sec. 11 (4)), cited as the "Atomic Energy Act of 1946", and subsequent Atomic Energy Acts.

(iv) Cases believed to sustain the jurisdiction are not known to Appellant because of the secrecy surrounding any prior decisions.

(v) Page 770, Public Laws—CH 724, Aug. 1, 1946, (60 Stat., Sec. 11 (4)), under Payment of Awards (C), and 36 Stat. 1157, worded—

> "The court's judgment shall be final, subject, however, to review by the Supreme Court of the United States."

(c)(1) The questions presented by this appeal are:

1. That Cornell Grossman is the inventor who first gave the Atomic Hydrogen Bomb chemical formulas to the United States Government and that the Government did use his formulas in New Mexico, at Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and all subsequent atomic hydrogen explosions.

2. That the Atomic Energy Commission and the Court, despite the time given, were giving Appellant a predetermined brush-off.

3. That the previous hearings were hostile to a just decision.

4. That the Atomic Energy Commission and previous Court published to all the world Appellant's Atomic Hydrogen Bomb formulas by failure to have a private court hearing where the formula could have been proven, and by the Atomic Energy Commission's failure to keep secret the Appellant's formula.

5. That Appellant's formula was made available to others.

6. That the Docket 17 was not kept in secrecy by the United States Court of Appeals.

7. That the Green Glass, formed from the melted sand in the first atomic bomb detonation, was green because of Appellant's three ingredients, which are used commercially to make glass green, and which are used by nature to make a green sand.

8. That the coloration and the chemical reaction in every atomic hydrogen detonation is identical with Appellant's formula and pathognomic to only Appellant's formula, and the syndrome of the effects on

human beings, and everything else, is found only in Appellant's formula.

9. That Appellant's formula is atomic.

10. That Appellant's formula is in the domain of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

11. That the Japanese doctor who describes the Nagasaki bomb mentions its resemblance to one of Appellant's ingredients, and identifies, by odor, another chemical that came out of the bomb at Nagasaki.

12. That the death syndrome at Hiroshima and Nagasaki was that of Appellant's atomic poison gas products of the bomb, and the particles in that gas.

13. That Docket 17 is the United States Atomic Hydrogen bombs in formula. Docket 17 is now in the possession of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States. Docket 17 points out that an accidental explosion of one of Appellant's ingredients left a crater of a million cubic feet, and devastation two miles away. That another ingredient left devastation of tremendous proportions in an accidental explosion. That the combining of these two ingredients, with the other ingredients in Appellant's formula, is the Atomic Hydrogen Bomb. That the opposite nature of these two ingredients renders the atomic violence.

14. That before taking Appellant's Request for Compensation, the head of the Patent Compensation Board of the United States Atomic Energy Commission said to Appellant—"I don't want to take this application for compensation, and I won't take it," and had an angry, hostile demeanor to Appellant. That the three judges of the Patent Compensation Board

were hostile to Appellant at the hearing and did not let him properly present the chemicals. That one of the judges of the Patent Compensation Board of the U.S.A.E.C. had been a consultant to General Electric, and the other judge had been with a subsidiary of General Dynamics. That the patent lawyer whom Appellant had tried to engage told Appellant that General Electric wished to maintain a monopoly in the atomic field. That, though it was legal for these men to form the U.S.A.E.C. Patent Compensation Board, the spirit of the United States Atomic Energy Act was violated in that Appellant, as a private inventor, felt that he was against a stone wall of monopoly not intended in the Act.

15. That two of the members of the Patent Compensation Board did not know chemistry, according to the third member, and it was not in the spirit of the Act, which was designed to protect the United States, to have men not qualified to judge technically.

16. Did Colonel Dwight D. Eisenhower receive the atomic hydrogen bomb formulas from Appellant to end World War II quickly in American victory shortly after Pearl Harbor?

17. Did the United States Government and the United States Atomic Energy Commission intercept a letter to the Canadian government written by Appellant? This was intercepted despite the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission gave Appellant the right to sell this bomb formula to Canada, and other nations.

18. That the Supreme Court shall grant a private hearing to Appellant so the public will not learn the Atomic Hydrogen Bombs formulas as they really are.

19. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Appeals Court by their decision are in complete error when they deny all of the true facts hereinbefore mentioned in all of this jurisdictional statement just as they are in error, in complete error, when they deny Appellant's ingredients are in the Kyoto Report.

20. Docket 17 is part of this jurisdictional statement. The U.S.A.E.C. is in complete error and in order not to make this statement voluminous Appellant prays that the hundreds of proofs be omitted so the printers will not see them, and so that he may present them in proper secrecy.

21. All of the text books support the inventor in this. The Appeals Court and the Atomic Commission having denied the hundred proofs in the text books are in error in their prior decisions. Appellant will bring two dozen text books showing he is completely right and truthful in all of this. The Atomic Commission refused to detonate the Appellant's formula which detonation would prove it to be the Atomic Hydrogen Bomb. The Commission also refused to let the Appellant buy the ingredients, and hindered test detonations. Therefor, this appeal should be granted since the spirit of the act is to promote private atomic inventions and help inventors without monopoly except by the Government.

The Supreme Court should grant this prayer to remand the appellant's Atomic-Hydrogen Bomb Invention to the United States Atomic Energy Commission because the Patent Compensation Board Judges were prejudiced possibly by their connections with monopoly, as shown by their endeavor to cut the

Inventor off from stating the chemical formula, judging it to be not atomic even before the appellant stated his chemicals and the hostility manifested by the Judges and the head of the Board.

Most respectfully yours,

CORNELL JOEL GROSSMAN, D.D.S.
46 Old Short Hills Road
Millburn, New Jersey
Pro Se.